

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/592,368	BUGNION, EDOUARD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Mohammad A Siddiqi	2154	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Mohammad A Siddiqi. (3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Jeffrey Pearce. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 03 November 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No.  
If Yes, brief description: 6308318.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: \_\_\_\_\_.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: discussed proposed amendment to overcome reference relied upon.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Krishnaswamy discloses delaying handling of each asynchronous sensed exception (col 3, lines 45-67), at any point in the translated target instruction (col 3, lines 45-67, col 4, lines 1-25, col 7, lines 1-25), from the point in the translated target instruction sequence at which the asynchronous exception was sensed (guaranteed application state recoverable points referred as GAR point, col 2, lines 46-49, col 3, lines 45-55, col 4, lines 11-20, col 5, lines 10-17, col 6, lines 1-15).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention was made to improve the combine teachings of Yates and Krishnaswamy. The motivation would have been to have a single common strategy for processing all exceptions raised during the binary translation either by source or target ISA and execute exception handler on either source ISA or target ISA.